

REMARKS**I. Claims 9 and 10 – 35 USC §112 Rejection**

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to address the objections in the Office Action.

Specifically, Claim 9, line 3 has been amended to change “sets of those data” to “assigned sets of co-ordinates” to make it clear that the data are the assigned sets of coordinates.

In addition, Claim 10, line 2 has been amended to recite:

- “an actual structure” instead of “the actual structure”.
- “the desired object” instead of “the object”. There is proper antecedency for “the desired object”, since Claim 1 now defines “a desired object”.
- “an initial state” instead of “the initial state”.

These changes cure the antecedency issues cited in the Office Action.

II. Claims 1-4, 9, and 10 – 35 USC §103 Rejection – Kokaji et al. in view of Shen et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate key elements of allowed Claim 7. Specifically,

Claim 1 now further defines:

- That the reciprocal position of the solid elements is a result of a change in the magnetic polarization of the casing walls, the change being accomplished by activation or inactivation of the solid elements.

- That the programmed instructions contain information about a desired object to be constructed and about the successive running number that the inactive single solid element being connected represents in the actual object constructed thus far, the instructions being transmitted from the integrated circuit of an active solid element to the integrated circuit of an inactive solid element.

- That the integrated circuits are adapted to decide whether to activate or deactivate the casing walls, and which casing walls to activate or deactivate, so that the solid elements are linked together successively.

The above changes render Claim 1 patentable over Kokaji and Shen, in the same manner that allowed Claim 7 is patentable over Kokaji and Shen and indeed all the prior art. Claims 2-4, 9, and 10 are all dependent on Claim 1, and are patentable for the same reasons.

III. Claims 5 and 6 – 35 USC §103 Rejection – Kokaji et al. in view of Shen et al., Michael, and Murata et al.

Claims 5 and 6 are also dependent on Claim 1, and are patentable over the proposed combination of Kokaji, Shen, Michael, and Murata for the same reasons. That is, none of these references disclose the key elements of allowed Claim 7 which have now been incorporated into Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the claims are in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. The application is therefore in condition for allowance, and Applicant requests such action.

Respectfully,

/John A. Galbreath/
John A. Galbreath, Reg. #46,718

Galbreath Law Offices, P.C.
2516 Chestnut Woods Court
Reisterstown, MD 21136
Tel. (410) 628-7770